

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



June 2016 No 967

OCCIDENTAL OBSERVER

White Identity, Interests, and Culture

Jewish Fear and Loathing of Donald Trump (4): Neocon Angst About A Fascist America

By [Kevin MacDonald](#), May 22, 2016

[The Washington Post](#)

This is how fascism comes to America



The Republican candidate continues to dominate the presidential contests.

By Robert Kagan

Robert Kagan is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a contributing columnist for The Post.

The Republican Party's attempt to treat Donald Trump as a normal political candidate would be laughable were it not so perilous to the republic. If only he would march the party's "conservative" principles, all would be well.

Previously posted at [VDARE.com](#)

The reactions of anonymous people on Twitter criticizing Jews are now fodder for news stories by both ["right wing" Jews like Ben Shapiro](#) and more liberal journalists like Jonathan Weisman. [\[Trump's supporters unleash anti-Semitic attack on New York Times editor\]](#), by Sophia Tesfaye, *Salon*, May 20, 2016] Somehow, all the [death threats](#), vulgar criticism, and actual violence conservatives have received over the years never become a [source of sympathy from the Main Stream Media!](#)

One of the more spectacular examples of an MSM frenzy over supposed anti-Semitism: the reaction to [the attack by David Horowitz against his fellow Jew Bill Kristol](#), [leader](#) of a [campaign](#) to destroy Donald Trump

[Bill Kristol: Republican Spoiler, Renegade Jew](#), May 15, 2016] The headline, written by Horowitz, alluded to Kristol being Jewish. As Jonathan S. Tobin [\[Email him\]](#) notes in *Commentary*, [T]he real offense here is ... his attempt to wrap him in the Star of David and to



somehow brand his opponents as traitors to the pro-Israel cause. ...

[H]is invocation of "America First" and the use of a term like "renegade Jew" in the headline (though not in the text of the article) seems to echo the smears of the pro-Trump alt right racists who have attacked conservative critics of the candidate with an avalanche of anti-Semitic invective.

[[Breitbart's 'Renegade Jew' Disgrace](#), May 16, 2016]

Horowitz's offense was not simply criticizing Kristol's campaign against Trump. Lots of people have done that without incurring the wrath of *Commentary*. And even saying that Kristol's views are not good for Jews and Israel is commonplace: [Mondoweiss, J Street](#), and [Mearsheimer and Walt](#) in *The Israel Lobby* argue that neoconservatives and the Israel Lobby have a tragically mistaken view of Jewish and Israeli interests—also discussed in [Charles Bloch](#)'s and [Steve Sailer](#)'s VDARE posts.

The unforgivable offense: implying Kristol's being a Jew had something to do with his opposition to Trump. After all, there would have been exactly zero upset if instead the headline was "Bill Kristol: Republican Spoiler, Renegade Republican."

But putting 'Jew' in the headline was guaranteed to bring out immediate charges of anti-Semitism by the likes of [Michelle Goldberg](#) [[Email her](#)] in *Slate*:

To define someone as a 'Renegade Jew' in a column about scheming elites written for an audience full of white nationalists is to signal to the sewers. ... A narrative is taking shape, an American [Dolchstoßlegende](#) that will blame a potential Trump loss on conniving Semites.



[[Breitbart Calls Trump Foe "Renegade Jew." This Is How Anti-Semitism Goes Mainstream](#), May 16, 2016]

Of course, we are supposed to engage in the fiction that the opinions of Bill Kristol *et al.* have nothing to do with being Jewish or what is good for Israel, but everything to do with their perception of what is good for America.

And of course, this goes well beyond neocons to include Jews in the media generally. For example, the [ADL](#) condemns the idea [Jews have an outsized influence in Hollywood](#) by claiming that Hollywood Jews just "happen to be Jews"—that their Jewish identity does not affect the [content](#) of movies or television. [[Alleged Jewish 'Control' of the American Motion Picture Industry](#), September 1999] As I've painstakingly documented [over the course of my career](#), this is patently absurd. In fact, the Jewish identities and sense of Jewish interests of the neocons are obvious from a close reading of their careers [[Understanding Jewish Influence III: Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement](#), by Kevin MacDonald, *The Occidental Quarterly*, August 2004].

While it's obviously true that Trump has support among some Jews linked to the GOP, there is one Jewish faction that is all but apoplectic he might win [[Where Jewish conservatives stand on Donald Trump: A running tally](#), by Ron Kampeas, *Jewish Telegraph Agency*, May 6, 2016]. And there can be little doubt that their opposition is fueled by their Jewish identity.

This mystifying to some. For example, Bill O'Reilly seemed genuinely bewildered when he [interviewed](#) (at

3:00) Charles Krauthammer—another ardent neocon opponent of Trump—about a Bret Stephens article in the *Wall Street Journal*.

Stephens was triggered by Trump's use of the phrase "America First" and decried "the Republican descent into populism" [[The GOP Gets What It Deserves](#), May 2, 2016]. O'Reilly couldn't help but observe, "he's really teed off, he's really angry."

Stephens' outburst was nothing compared to the [anti-Trump invective](#) spewed by neocon stalwart Max Boot [[email him](#)]



Boot said:

I would vote for a conservative third-party candidate or for Hillary Clinton. I regard Donald Trump as an ignorant demagogue who is one of the most dangerous candidates ever to run for the American presidency and one of the least qualified. ... He has shown that he doesn't understand the basics of policy, he has shown that he is erratic, he is xenophobic, he is guilty of sexist and racist comments ...

Let's remember, this is the guy who wants to ban all Muslims from the country, he wants to send the police breaking into American homes to round up 11 million undocumented migrants; ... He has hijacked the party. ... He is not remotely conservative. He is a populist demagogue, xenophobic... [[BBC Newsnight](#) (YouTube) May 9, 2016]

This sort of anger is hardly likely to come from Trump's supposed lack of concern about "limited government," or "commitment to the Constitution," "true conservatism," or even his personal qualities.

In unpacking these talking points, it's useful to separate the red herrings from more fundamental concerns. For real conservatives, such as Mike Huckabee, Rick Perry, and Newt Gingrich, this election is a simple choice between someone who would be far better than Hillary Clinton on fundamental issues conservatives claim to hold dear. There is in fact a long list of Trump policies and proposals that are conservative by any reckoning—promising [Scalia](#)-like Supreme Court appointments, [securing the border](#) and deporting illegals, [supporting the police](#) against the Black Lives Matter movement, promising to end Obamacare, doing away with [Common Core](#), taking strong pro-life and [pro-Second Amendment](#) stands, and supporting the military and veterans. [[Trump unveils his potential Supreme Court nominees](#), by Jeremy Diamond, *CNN*, May 28, 2016]

Neocons never threatened to run a third-party candidate against "compassionate conservative" George W. Bush even though he was far [more liberal](#) than Trump—proposing [Amnesty](#) for illegals, expanding Medicare entitlements, signing [No Child Left Behind](#), and racking up huge budget deficits—what some have called "Big Government Conservatism" [[The liberal leanings of George W. Bush](#), by John Ibitson, *The Globe and Mail*, April 3, 2009]. Nor was Mitt Romney a small-government candidate. [[Back to Bush's Big-Government Conservatism](#), by Michael Tanner, *National Review*, November 30, 2011]

For neocons, the huge expansion of entitlements, promotion of culture-destroying immigration, and rampaging budget deficits were not offenses against "conservatism." These policies didn't even register as a

problem. It was more important that Bush carried out their (disastrous) neoconservative foreign policy. It's impossible to take the dedication of self-styled "conservatives" like Stephens and Kristol to conservative principles seriously. After all, they refuse to acknowledge that unless we deal with the problem of importing millions of Third Worlders who both vote for and utilize *welfare* and "big government," any kind of "limited government" will be impossible.

Another very basic principle actual conservatives support is freedom of speech. Immigration threatens this as well. Universities throughout the West are under siege by the intolerant Left, and one more liberal appointment to the Supreme Court could well be the end of the First Amendment. Intellectual rationales for curtailing First Amendment freedoms, and in particular speech critical of the multicultural ideal, are already common in liberal academic circles [[Why we should ban "hate speech."](#), by Jared Taylor, *American Renaissance*, August 24, 2012]. Continuing to import millions from intolerant Third World cultures does not bode well.

Yet Stephens and Kristol soft-pedal the effect the catastrophic impact of a President Hillary Clinton. Indeed, Kristol [[Email him](#)] is given to Pollyannaish tweets that a Third-Party candidate would actually win.

Follow



[Bill Kristol](#)

✓ [@BillKristol](#)

There is a viable path to victory for a credible independent candidate. Not easy, but doable. <http://datatargeting.com/POTUS>

5:46 AM – 18 May 2016

- [249249 Retweets](#)
- [360360 likes](#)

This is presumably to avoid the charge that he is really quite happy with Clinton and her pro-Israel donors, notably [Haim Saban](#) [[Jane Harmon, Haim Saban, and AIPAC: The Disloyalty Issue in Multicultural America](#), by Kevin MacDonald, *The Occidental Observer*, April 25, 2009].

Indeed, it's hard to see why Kristol would disapprove of Hillary's neocon foreign policy advisers like [Robert Kagan](#), [[Email him](#)] who advocates military intervention and *democracy creation* throughout the Middle East as a moral imperative [[Neocon Kagan Endorses Hillary Clinton](#), *ConsortiumNews*, February 25, 2016]. Needless to say, this doesn't stop Kagan from portraying Trump as a fascist [[This is how fascism comes to America](#), *Washington Post*, May 18, 2016].

So why are neocons so upset? Two reasons:

1.) **Trump has rejected basic neocon foreign policy positions on the Middle East.** Trump opposed the Iraq war which was promoted by the neocons, calling it a "complete disaster." Amazingly, he stated:

"They lied. They said there were weapons of mass destruction and there were none. And they knew there were none. There were no weapons of mass destruction."

[[Trump vs. Bush: They Said There Were Weapons of Mass Destruction And They Knew There Were None. They Lied](#), *Real Clear Politics*, February 13, 2016]

Trump has also supported friendly relations with Vladimir Putin's Russia and supported an effort to achieve stability in the Middle East by propping up the Assad government

in Syria. Assad and Putin are very high on the neocon hate list.

And Trump has given mixed signals on Israel, speaking about neutrality in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and avoiding money from the Republican Jewish Coalition. His most recent speech on the topic, at AIPAC, was intended to quell Jewish fears and mend fences, but the *Washington Post*'s token (neo) conservative [Jennifer Rubin](#) [[email her](#)] emphasized that this speech was recited from a teleprompter, implying that it didn't reflect his real views [[Trumpkins and the Jews](#), *Washington Post*, May 16, 2016]

Of course, Trump has received [promises of support from Sheldon Adelson](#). He also hired ex-AIPAC official Michael Glassner and other prominent Jews to high positions in his campaign [[Trump names Jewish financier, fixer to major campaign positions](#), by Nathan Guttman, *Forward*, May 7, 2016]

But Trump has given no indication that he would appoint any neocons to his administration. And, unlike George W. Bush, Trump is not a babe in the woods, ready to be dominated by a coterie of neocons. This would mean that the neocons would be deprived of their primary power base, with no choice but to defect to the Democrats (from [whence they came](#)).

2.) **Trump represents the undoing of elite consensus on immigration, multiculturalism, and the moral imperative that white Americans become a minority in a country they created.**

All of these radically Leftist positions have now been subsumed into "conservative" dogma.

The fact is neocons have *never* been true conservatives. They adopted conservative positions of convenience in order to appeal to the GOP base. The problem for them now: the base, energized by Trump, is finally ignoring the moral pronouncements coming from on high and voting on the issues that really matter to them, *trade*, *jobs*, and *immigration*. And yes, they also love [Trump's disdain for Political Correctness](#).

Bret Stephens of the *Wall Street Journal*

is well aware that what he calls "modern conservatism" is a departure from older conservative traditions, which have been the prime target of Jewish intellectuals throughout the twentieth century, including the neoconservatives (labeled as "modern conservatives" by Stephens).

Stephens [[Email him](#)] wrote

[Trumpism] is a regression to the *conservatism of blood and soil*, of *ethnic polarization and bullying nationalism*. Modern conservatives sought to bury this rubbish with a politics that strikes a balance between respect for tradition and faith in the dynamic and culture-shifting possibilities of open markets. When that balance collapses—under a Republican president, no less—it may never again be restored, at least in our lifetimes. [[Emphases added throughout](#)]

[[Hillary, the Conservative Hope](#), May 9, 2016]

Or Jennifer Rubin, cited above:

Trump's *nativism* and *xenophobia* make him toxic with a good deal of the American Jewish community for whom such sentiments have invariably been associated with governments hostile to Jews.

Or Robert Kagan, cited above:

[Trump's] public discourse consists of attacking or ridiculing a wide range of "others"—Muslims, Hispanics, women, Chinese, Mexicans, Europeans, Arabs, immigrants, refugees—whom he depicts either as threats or as objects of derision. His program, such as it is,

consists chiefly of promises to get tough with foreigners and people of nonwhite complexion. He will deport them, bar them, get them to knuckle under, make them pay up or make them shut up.

Contra Stephens, the neocons never respected tradition and gave only lip service to faith. Their only outreach was [recruiting](#) Evangelical [Christians](#) to the cause of a rabidly pro-Israel foreign policy.

Stephens is correct in that there was an older tradition of conservatism based on the ethno-national interests of the traditional American majority. This [was purged by the neocons](#). They are now afraid it is returning, perhaps in the form of the Alt Right—the only recognizable intellectual constituency that supports Trump.

In fact, the intellectual antecedents of the Alt Right go back much further than the conservatives of the 1980s who were purged by the neocons. Their roots go back to [Madison Grant](#), Lothrop Stoddard, Henry Pratt Fairchild, William Ripley, [Gustave Le Bon](#), Charles Davenport, and William McDougall. The Alt Right is an updated version of this intellectual milieu of the early twentieth century when America was self-consciously a European, Christian nation and proud of it [[Enemies of my enemy](#), by Kevin MacDonald, [KevinMacDonald.com](#), Accessed May 20, 2016]. They go [back](#) to Charles Lindbergh and the [America First](#) movement that has received so much attention since Trump began using the phrase. Significantly, the ADL was among those urging Trump to abandon the phrase [[ADL urges Donald Trump to Reconsider "America First" in Foreign Policy Approach](#), ADL, April 28, 2016]

This early conservative tradition was eradicated by the rise of [Franz Boas](#) and the other Jewish-dominated intellectual movements of the left discussed in [The Culture of Critique](#)—an intellectual framework that has been embraced by the neocons.

As Robert Kagan writes of Trump:

If he wins the election, his legions will comprise a majority of the nation. Imagine the power he would wield then. In addition to all that comes from being the leader of a mass following, he would also have the immense powers of the American presidency at his command: the Justice Department, the FBI, the intelligence services, the military. Who would dare to oppose him then? Certainly not a Republican Party that laid down before him even when he was comparatively weak. And is a man like Trump, with infinitely greater power in his hands, likely to become more humble, more judicious, more generous, less vengeful than he is today, than he has been his whole life? Does vast power un-corrupt?

This is how fascism comes to America.

But perhaps fascism is in the eye of the beholder. After all, it's in the West of today that certain ideas are illegal, certain [political parties are banned](#), and the majority populations of white nations are openly despised, [dispossessed](#), and have their [public policy views](#) dismissed by [unelected judges](#).

How is resisting such tyrannical and genocidal policies "fascist?"

It's not that Trump is bringing "fascism," it's that there's a chance he might be bringing freedom for European-Americans. And for all their talk of tolerance, that's one thing the Culture of Critique will never allow.

Kevin MacDonald [[email him](#)] is emeritus professor of psychology at California State University—Long Beach. His research has focused on developing evolutionary perspectives in developmental psychology, personality theory, Western culture, and ethnic relations (group

evolutionary strategies). He edits and is a frequent contributor to [The Occidental Observer](#) and [The Occidental Quarterly](#). For his website, click [here](#).

Posted in [Featured Articles](#), [Neoconservatism](#)

7 Comments to "Jewish Fear and Loathing of Donald Trump (4): Neocon Angst About A Fascist America"

You can follow all the replies to this entry through the [comments feed](#)

Greekman - May 22, 2016 - 2:30 pm | Permalink

On the subject of Jewish people, I've noticed something with the secular Jews. Secular Jews such as Noam Chomsky and Norman Finkelstein, reject the idea that Jewish people hold a great amount of influence and power that is disproportionate to the Jewish population. When it comes to Israel, coincidentally, Noam claims that it is not the Jews in Israel that're responsible for the oppression and ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians, but it is the US, and the American tax payers fault. Noam and Norman peddle the idea that we (the US) use Israel to protect our "oil interests" and that's why we support them. They reject the Neo-Con influence notion (Noam claims to love facts, but when it comes to questions relating to Jews, suddenly, he opts for blurring the lines). The game being played is obvious. They don't want the actions of the Jews in Israel to reflect badly on the entire Jewish collective, so in this way, Noam and Normal are looking out for the tribe. I know this is inherently irrelevant to this article, but I truly believe more attention needs to be paid to people like Noam and Normal, as they're praised as being "great" intellectuals and what Noam says is law for some people. Kevin, perhaps you could do an analysis of how secular Jews attempt to divert attention from Jewish wrongdoing and how they attempt to switch the blame unto others. I know you've wrote tons and tons of work on the analysis of Jewish wrongdoing being pinned on others, but the secular Jews, in my opinion, play a very different game than what is normally talked about.

Greekman - May 22, 2016 - 2:37 pm | Permalink

<http://www.tabletmag.com/jewish-news-and-politics/50260/qa-noam-chomsky> (Interview where Noam attempts to pin the crimes of Israel on the US and the American tax payers)

<http://www.tabletmag.com/jewish-arts-and-culture/books/102054/qa-norman-finkelstein> (Interview where Norman mocks the Neo-Conservative influence idea)

Noam and Normal attempt to "debunk" the Jewish Neo-Con ideas but they do nothing of the sort.

gubbler chechenova - May 22, 2016 - 12:47 pm | Permalink

White Progs are a funny-wunny bunch.

Even though they pontificate about equality, their world-view is predicated on white superiority or at least the herculean effort on part of whites to be superior.

Progs are sort of like vegans.

Vegans won't eat meat cuz they see animals as equally precious as human lives.

But... but... but... animals kill and eat each other all the time. Animals live by feeding on other animals. And even herbivores depend on predators because, without predators, herbivores will eat up all the plants and they will die of starvation.

So, if vegans love animals so much and see them as equally precious to humans, why do they reject the animal way? The animal way is for animals to kill and eat animals. If vegans see animals as equal to humans, shouldn't humans act like animals and eat meat? If animals are so wonderful, the animal way must be wonderful.

This is where veganism gets weird. Even though veganism sees animal life as equal to human life, they believe humans must be judged by higher/superior standards. You see, animals can't help themselves since they live by beastly instinct. They are not intellectually, morally, or spiritually capable of rising above their instinct. But humans do have such ability. So, humans must rise above instinct for meat-eating and be vegans.

So, vegan view of animals as equal to humans is contradicted by vegan view that humans must be judged by higher standards since humans are SUPERIOR in intellect and soul.

Same logic applies to Progs. They see non-whites as equal to whites in worth. Therefore, non-whites should be allowed to come and live in white lands without restriction. Non-whites should use white wombs to produce non-white babies.

But Progs don't judge non-whites for their tribalism, militarism, violence, machismo, anti-gay attitudes, infantile behavior, and etc. Even though non-whites are seen as equal to whites, they are also seen as beastly folks trapped in tradition and/or instinct and cannot break out of their natural/cultural shells. So, the moral criteria that apply to whites cannot be applied to non-whites, especially savage Negroes and reactionary Muslims.

So, Progs say whites must see non-whites as equal but only whites must be judged by higher moral standards since only whites are intellectually, morally, and spiritually capable of higher ideas and values.

It's like Jesus said, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Well, Jesus died in a bad way. If whites wanna go that way, they can play the Prog game and forgive non-whites who destroy white civilization for 'not knowing what they do.'

Christian Westerns rose in power and wealth because they chose to be Forgiven than to be the Forgivers. They did badass stuff to gain power and wealth and then asked forgiveness from God and Jesus.

Now, each Prog wants to play Jesus and forgive non-whites who are invading and raping the West.

Buckle - May 22, 2016 - 11:26 am | [Permalink](#)

News reaches us from across the pond that Trump is about to be bought for a hundred million bucks. If this proves to be the case then this confirms the suspicion that he's broke.

I always thought the best outcome would have been a convention stitch up rather than a sell-out. I hope I'm wrong but good luck America in any event!

Ilena - May 22, 2016 - 10:59 am | [Permalink](#)

If Ron Paul was running I would vote for him. But, since he's not, I will likely vote Trump. I did vote in the Washington State primary for Trump, after seeing him at a Rally here. What sold me on Trump was exactly what Mr. MacDonald says about his views on foreign policy. And let the Neo-cons blather on, because they only make the case for Trump stronger. I know there is a chance a Trump presidency may not work out, but I am willing to give him a chance and hope at the very least he can make a large dent into the Zionist-Neo-Con-Israel-firsters agenda.

If the Jewish-Zionists maintain their ZPC (Petas: "zionist power configuration) via their beloved but hated Hillary, they will only need 8 more years to seal the destruction they have been doing all over Europe, Middle East, America, and the Caucasus regions.

Someday - May 22, 2016 - 10:24 am | [Permalink](#)

Knocking over countries like Iraq and Iran does nothing for Israel, because the Jewish state's problem is an internal one that cannot be transcended by any political arrangement.

The real offense here is ... his attempt to wrap him in the Star of David and to somehow brand his opponents as traitors to the pro-Israel cause.

Let us see what the alternative to Trump is for those committed to the Jewish state of Israel over their own careerist greasy pole climbing, unlike Boot and company.

<http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/clinton-palestinian-state-achieved-through-negotiations-is-inevitable-1.330001>

That is why the neocons and Clinton are every bit as bad for Israel as they are for America.

The promises of support from Sheldon Adelson despite Trump rejecting basic neocon foreign policy positions on the Middle East are easily explained. Adelson understands that the democratic transcendence of Israel's occupied territories ethnic problem, as advocated by the bipartisan US foreign policy establishment with neocon acquiescence is almost entirely ineffective at securing Israel's future. Clinton is clearly going to intervene to keep the Middle East calculus as it is, which means no opportunity for population movements, while Israel inexorably proceeds to the denouement that John Mearsheimer has outlined. Trump is signalling that he will (1) not intervene in Arab countries to keep Israel from having to. (2) cease trying for a solution and accept an outcome whereby war leads to population movements.

HBM - May 22, 2016 - 1:00 pm | [Permalink](#)

If you turn the countries surrounding Israel into a balkanized bloodbaths, it most certainly does do something. Perhaps foremost, it satisfies their mytho-ontological need for goyishe dupes to do their dirty work and for them to be able to keep up the appearance that they are merely observers of what those wacky goyim do. Muslims ignore Israel to slaughter one another. And also, as we've learned recently- and as will happen every time there is any conflict in Africa or the Middle East from here on out- Neocon-occupied Washington's destabilization of the region sends millions of Muslims running to Europe to teach them diversity and as punishment for thousands of years of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.

A civil war in Europe would give Israel the moral authority to conduct its own long-desired ethnic cleansing (European Jews will howl and stoke the fires and help the Muslims in Europe even as Israel itself will defend itself by claiming just to be following Europe's lead), or if the "Enlightened" (literally and metaphorically) Islam that is another possible outcome of an Islamified Europe comes about, paradoxically that could eventually produce the climate necessary to allow it, too. It also empties-out areas of Greater Israel for expansion.

Assuming Trump isn't overcome with Jewish advisers and money- and we can believe the message he appears to be telegraphing, it looks to me, for now, his plan is to tell Israel that we won't be giving them any more money because they are rich and powerful enough without us, and that they can do what they want as long as we aren't involved. This alone is enough to begin Jewish howling about "fascism", as it means Jews would have to fight their own battles and face the consequences of the things they do.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2016/05/jewish-fear-and-loathing-of-donald-trump-4-neocon-angst-about-a-fascist-america/>



Prince, Michael Jackson, and the Use of Music to Corrupt American Youth

By Dr. William L. Pierce (1984)

Rock "music" is one of the most manifest symptoms of the West's decline. Like modern "art" it is a cultural excrescence of a demented civilization which has turned on itself and is tearing madly at its own vitals.

The daubings of a Pollock, a Rauschenberg, a Rothko, or a Chagall, however, for all their malicious ugliness have had relatively little influence on the average denizen of this dying order, other than to convince him that art is irrelevant and artists are crazy.

Rock has had a far more destructive effect on the psyche of the West — especially that portion of the Western population born since the Second World War. A generation and a half have been immersed in this throbbing, screeching medium practically since birth.

For many it has formed an ever-present sonic background to childhood play and socializing, to adolescent dating, and to adult leisure. Often they do not escape from it even during the times set aside for study and work. Some are so conditioned by it that they become restless and uneasy whenever the beat stops.

Social psychologists may have explanations for this phenomenon in terms of the arrested character development brought on by the permissive child-rearing practices of the postwar era, or in terms of the widespread personal anomie which has accompanied the social dissolution of the period. Regardless of the mass-psychological factors involved in the ascendancy of rock, however, there can be no doubt that it has been the most lethal weapon in the cultural arsenal of the West's internal enemies. They have used it, with cold-blooded deliberation, to break down the racial, sexual, and cultural identities of young Westerners.

Although there was a time when the promoters of the rock phenomenon were more careful to conceal their motives, they now boast openly of what they have wrought.

Elvis Presley, they say, was their foot in the door: they used him, the "White boy with Black hips," to introduce Black music to America's White youth during the 1950s.

... Both mix black and white idioms in their music and both have shattered race barriers in the record business. . . . [A]nd both play coy with conventional racial and sexual definitions. As Prince sings in "Controversial" — "Am I black or white? / Am I straight or gay? / . . . Was I what you wanted me to be?"

... Mr. Jackson seems able to float effortlessly from pop to funk to rock, singing everything from gentle soul ballads to hard-driving rock and roll. And with "Purple Rain" Prince succeeded in fusing soul, gospel, rock, and funk into an idiom that transcends all color lines.[1]

The *New York Times* then goes on to describe Michael Jackson's racial and sexual "metamorphosis":

... Thanks to plastic surgery and cosmetics (plucked eyebrows and lots of eyeliner), his features have become more "white" and more feminine. In the "Off the Wall" (1979) album photo, he looks like a pleasant, but quite ordinary young black man; in the "Victory" (1984) album photo, he looks somehow different—delicate, pretty, almost angelic.



Prince preens for the camera and his audience of young Whites

Songs being sung to Black audiences by Black performers, such as the utterly raunchy and openly homosexual Little Richard, would be given to Presley to sing to White audiences, after the lyrics had been slightly sanitized. In England the Beatles served a similar purpose, taking their music from such Black rock performers as Chuck Berry.

Saturation exposure to Presley and the Beatles through the electronic media so accustomed Whites to Black forms and styles in music that it was not difficult for the media masters to take the next steps: the omission of the sanitizing, so that the non-White values in rock lyrics became more explicit; and then the gradual transformation of the unquestionably White and male rock stars upon whom the kids looked as idols to the racially and sexually ambivalent stars who reign today.

Two of those new reigning stars are Prince and Michael Jackson. In a recent article on them the *New York Times* gloated:



1971



1984



1987



2002



2005

There follows a description of a Jackson video production called "The Triumph":

... [T]he Jackson brothers appear as messianic spirits charged with leading people over the rainbow, into a better world. Floating over the earth like seraphs, the Jacksons begin to sing, and as they do all the people below — blacks, whites, and Asians — join hands and see a vision of a peacock in the sky. "The peacock is the only bird that integrates all the colors into one," Mr. Jackson explained once, "and that is what we are trying to represent through our music."

In view of the extremes to which the media masters have gone in promoting such filth as Prince and Jackson, it should not be surprising that there has been a grass-roots reaction even among young Whites already acclimated to rock. In Britain several "skinhead" rock bands have for the past couple of years been performing music which has expressed in very explicit lyrics the pent-up racial resentment of working-class White youth against that country's growing hordes of non-White immigrants — and against the media-church-government establishment which favors those immigrants at the expense of White workers.

Now the reaction is spreading to America. Southern California is the home of a number of rock bands imitating Britain's skinheads and bearing such names as

"SS Patrol" and "Aryan Justice." Performances of these bands are regularly accompanied by beatings of any non-Whites who make the mistake of being present.

Even New York has a rebel rock band, "N.Y. Skins." Its fans, who shave their heads in the manner of their British namesakes, have trounced bystanders who looked Jewish or seemed to have homosexual mannerisms.

A group of undergraduate students at Cornell University is promoting a rock band calling itself "Skrewdriver," and this band's lyrics are explicit indeed. A tape cassette of Skrewdriver songs being sold by the students contains such selections as "Hail the New Dawn," with several phrases borrowed directly from the "Horst Wessel Lied," and "Race and Nation," which begins:

I believe in the White race.
I believe in my country; it's where I belong; it's where I'll stay now.
Race and nation, yeah, yeah.
Race and nation, yeah, yeah.
Race and nation!
This nation's in the hands of fools,
Who are using Negroes as political tools. . . .

[1] *New York Times*, September 2, 1984, section 2, page 1.

Source: *National Vanguard* magazine, no. 102, December 1984, pp. 7-8; transcribed by Anthony Collins

Kerry slams Trump's wall, tells grads to prepare for 'borderless world'

By PETE KASPEROWICZ (@PETEKDCNEWS) • 5/6/16 12:04 PM



Secretary of State John Kerry took a shot at Donald Trump during his Friday commencement speech to Northeastern University graduates, by saying no wall is big enough to keep dangerous terrorists out of the United States.

"Many of you were in elementary school when you learned the toughest lesson of all on 9/11," he said in his speech at Boston Garden. "There are no walls big enough to stop people from anywhere, tens of thousands of miles away, who are determined to take their own lives while they target others."

"So I think that everything that we've lived and learned tells us that we will never come out on top if we accept advice from sound-bite salesmen and carnival barkers who pretend the most powerful country on Earth can remain great by looking inward," Kerry added. "And hiding behind walls at a time that technology has made that impossible to do and unwise to even attempt."

Kerry didn't mention Trump by name, but Trump has repeatedly called for a wall on the southern U.S. border, and many Democrats, and some Republicans, have taken to calling him a carnival barker.

Gov. Jan Brewer red cards Hillary Clinton's 'woman card'

By Anna Giaritelli - 05/10/16 12:44 AM

Kerry also seemed to dismiss the importance of national borders, and said technology has reshaped the world into one that the U.S. must engage at the risk of being left behind. He said Trump and others who want to look inward are making a mistake, even in the face of rising tension and violence in the world.

"For some people, that is all they need simply to climb under the sheets, close their eyes and push the world away," Kerry said. "And shockingly, we even see this attitude from some who think they ought to be entrusted with the job of managing international affairs."

"The future demands from us something more than a nostalgia for some rose-tinted version of the past that did not really exist in any case," he said. "You're about to graduate into a complex and borderless world."

This story was corrected to note that Kerry delivered his speech to graduates at Boston Garden.

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/kerry-slams-trumps-wall-tells-grads-to-prepare-for-borderless-world/article/2590596>

From: Horst Mahler horst_mahler@yahoo.de
Sent: Monday, 23 May 2016 8:56 AM
To: Stephan Dorn
Subject: Re: Volksgeist

Sehr geehrter Herr Dorn,
Sie fragen:

"Halten Sie es somit für unmöglich, dass Ausländer vollständig in das deutsche Volk integriert werden können?"

Das ist unmöglich, da ihnen die Prägung (zweite Geburt) des anderen Volkes fehlt. Sie bleiben Fremde. Fragen Sie doch 'mal bei Heinrich Grätz (Geschichte der Juden) nach dem Schicksal von Heinrich Heine und Ludwig Boerne! In geringer Zahl sind Ausländer u.U. "das Salz in der Suppe"; aber wer mag schon eine versalzende Suppe?

Kein Ausländer hat Anspruch auf Aufnahme in ein anderes Volk. Jedes Volk kann aber das Recht zu vorübergehendem oder

dauerndem Aufenthalt sowie die Staatsbürgerschaft verleihen. Da das Deutsche Volk seine staatliche Verfaßtheit durch die Gewalt der Sieger verloren hat und immer noch unter Fremdherrschaft steht, hat seit dem Tag der Verhaftung der Reichsregierung (23.05.1945) kein einziger Ausländer das Recht zum Aufenthalt auf dem Boden des Deutschen Reiches oder gar die Angehörigkeit zum Deutschen Reich erwerben können.

Sie fragen ferner:

"Könnte also ein Türke, der schon in der 3. Generation in Deutschland lebt sich mit der Idee der Volksgemeinschaft und mit der Idee des Reiches identifizieren oder wäre das völlig ausgeschlossen?"

Ein Türke, der in einer türkischen Familie seine Prägung erhalten hat, bleibt ein Türke. Beachten Sie bitte, daß in der Diaspora die fremde Volkszugehörigkeit besonders intensiv im familiären Raum gepflegt wird. Der resultierende Türke ist allerdings eine hybride Persönlichkeit ohne Wurzeln und beidseitiger Diskriminierung ausgesetzt.

Ganz allgemein folgt aus dem Begriff, daß Völker organische Geistwesen (das ist mehr als Lebewesen) sind, die den Trieb zur Selbsterhaltung in sich haben. Dieser äußert sich im Verhältnis zu anderen Völkern sowohl als Abstoßung als auch als Anziehung. Die Abstoßung ist intensiver, wenn der Phänotypus (DAS IST MEHR ALS ÄUSSERLICHE ERSCHENUNG) stark vom Eigenbild abweicht, das jeder Mensch in sich trägt. Das ist begrifflich notwendig zur Erhaltung der Vielfalt, die der eigentliche Reichtum ist. Die Vermischung ist ein Übel (ein Beispiel der Auflösung der Ordnung/Entropie).

Weitere Frage:

"Wenn ja, warum? Wegen der Unzertrennlichkeit von Geist und Rasse? Ist diese Wechselwirkung von Innerem und Äußerem eine Grenze, die er nicht überschreiten kann? Die Rede ist hier nicht von Einzelfällen."

Die Einsheit von Geist und Rasse ergibt in dem erörterten Zusammenhang kein Argument. Die von Ihnen angesprochene Problematik ist nicht die von Geist und Rasse, sondern der Volksidentität, und damit notwendig der Selbstherrschaft der Völker. Hinter Ihrer Frage lauert der Rassismusvorwurf. Dazu ein Wort: Es sind die Erzrassisten, die uns mit derlei Vorwürfen bekriegen. In der Erscheinung des Moses ist Gott als JAHWE nicht nur als der Unschaubare zu sich gekommen, sondern auch als Rassefanatiker in höchster Steigerungsform. Mehr Rassismus als der Jüdische geht gar nicht.

Sie schreiben:

"Völker unterscheiden sich innerlich durch den Volksgeist und äußerlich durch Rassenmerkmale."

Meinen Sie diesen Satz bei mir gefunden zu haben? Ggf. müßte ich diesen widerrufen, weil er irreführend ist. Völker unterscheiden sich als je besondere Gestalten Gottes. Das je Besondere erscheint in seinen Momenten als Einsheit von Geist und Materie. Es gibt Völker gleicher Rasse., die aber nicht in einem Volk sein sollen und das auch nicht wollen.

Sie geben zu bedenken:

"Wenn aber das absolute Wissen von jedem nachvollzogen werden kann, da es sich im reinen Denken abspielt, dann müsste doch das äußere Erscheinungsbild gleichgültig sein? Kann die unmittelbare Gewissheit, die im reinen Denken erlangt wird, nicht unabhängig von Volksgeist und Rasse erfolgen? Ich denke schon."

Wie könnte es gedacht werden, daß Absolutes Wissen die Grenzen der Völker aufhebt? Das Absolute Wissen erfaßt sich in seinem Gewordensein und bleibt gerade dadurch als Geistesgestalt eine Singularität. Sie entschweben mit Absolutem Wissen nicht in den Himmel, sondern bleiben der irdische (endliche) Geist, der Sie sind.

Verwechseln Sie nicht Absolutes Wissen überhaupt mit seiner Fülle? Auch mit und nach Hegel hört das Denken doch nicht auf, sondern produziert in alle Unendlichkeit in sich immer neue Gedanken. Um sie wird auch weiter gestritten werden. Sonst wär's ja nicht auszuhalten.

Sie folgern:

"Demnach wäre doch der Grad der Vermischung unabhängig von z.B. der Einsicht in die Idee der Freiheit der Person"

Geist und Vermischung gehen nicht zusammen. Der Begriff des Geistes ist Fürsich-Sein gegen anderes Fürsich-Sein (Eins und anderes Eins).). Das ist unmittelbar einsichtig, wenn der Begriff als ICH gefaßt wird. Stellen Sie sich doch einmal Ihre "Vermischung" vor! Nur weil Volksgeister nicht wie jedes natürliche Ich unmittelbares Dasein sondern allgemeine Person sind, d.h. nur vermittels des Denkens in Erscheinung treten, nimmt ihnen die Übereinstimmung im Vernunftdenken (das nämlich ist Absolutes Denken, im Unterschied zum Verstandesdenken) nicht ihr Fürsich-Sein.

Ganz allgemein zu Ihren Fragen: Vergessen Sie nie, daß das Volk das Erste ist, das die Individuation der Volksgenossen zur Person (also zu Trägern von Rechten und Pflichten) überhaupt erst denkbar macht. Aber zu beachten ist, daß der Satz "Dein Volk ist alles, Du bist nichts" eine Entstellung des Nationalsozialismus ist.

Es hat mich gefreut, mit Ihren Fragen herausgefordert worden zu sein.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen - Horst Mahler

Von: Stephan Dorn <stephan.dorn@gmx.net

An: horst_mahler@yahoo.de

Gesendet: 18:12 Sonntag, 22.Mai 2016

Betreff: Volksgeist

Guten Tag Herr Mahler

ich habe mit Interesse ihre Schriften gelesen. Während der Diskussion mit anderen Menschen sind Fragen aufgetaucht, die ich Ihnen gerne stellen möchte.

In Ihrem Aufstandsplan schreiben sie, dass Geist und Rasse beide gleichgewichtig, unzertrennlich und gleich wichtig Abwehrfronten gegen das Fremde sind, da Inneres und Äußeres ein und dasselbe und zugleich unterschieden sind. Völker unterscheiden sich innerlich durch den Volksgeist und äußerlich durch Rassenmerkmale.

Halten Sie es somit für unmöglich, dass Ausländer vollständig in das deutsche Volk integriert werden können? Könnte also ein Türke, der schon in der 3. Generation in Deutschland lebt sich mit der Idee der Volksgemeinschaft und mit der Idee des Reiches identifizieren oder wäre das völlig ausgeschlossen? Wenn ja, warum? Wegen der Unzertrennlichkeit von Geist und Rasse? Ist diese Wechselwirkung von Innerem und Äußerem eine Grenze, die er nicht überschreiten kann? Die Rede ist hier nicht von Einzelfällen.

Dementsprechend würde also der deutsche Volksgeist verloren gehen, wenn die Deutschen durch Vermischung mit Südländern einen anderen Phänotyp bekämen?

Wenn aber das absolute Wissen von jedem nachvollzogen werden kann, da es sich im reinen Denken abspielt, dann müsste doch das äußere Erscheinungsbild gleichgültig sein? Kann die unmittelbare Gewissheit, die im reinen Denken erlangt wird, nicht unabhängig von Volksgeist und Rasse erfolgen? Ich denke schon.

Demnach wäre doch der Grad der Vermischung unabhängig von z.B. der Einsicht in die Idee der Freiheit der Person.

Ich bin gespannt auf Ihre Antwort.

Grüße - Stephan Dorn

Ausländer, die wie Deutsche sprechen und schon in der 3. Generation hier leben. Warum sind sie keine Deutschen? Warum ist es nicht egal wieviele Ausländer hier leben?

Ausländer fähig idee volksgemeinschaft hat ihr Zentrum in der Idee des Reiches, dessen Träger die Volksgemeinschaft der Deutschen ist. Sie ist der lebendige Gedanke, in dem der Einzelne als Volksgenosse, dadurch frei ist, daß er sich als Teil eines Ganzen weiß, dem er seine Freiheit verdankt, für das er deshalb auch Verantwortung trägt

Völker unterscheiden sich innerlich durch den Volksgeist und äußerlich durch Rassenmerkmale?

Wieviele Ausländer ist ein Volk fähig aufzunehmen?

Halten Sie es für ausgeschlossen, dass ein orientalisch aussehender Mann sich dem deutschen Volksgeist zugehörig fühlen kann, da Geist und Rasse gleichgewichtig und unzertrennlich und gleich wichtige Abwehrfronten gegen das Fremde sind

Was soll denn passieren wenn immer mehr ausländer kommen?